

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ALLISON CURRY et al.,)	
)	
Appellants,)	Case No. ALLO-99-0026
)	
v.)	ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING
)	ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATIONS OF
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS)	THE DIRECTOR
Respondent.)	
)	
)	
)	
)	

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, on Appellants' exceptions to the Director's determination dated August 27, 1999. The hearing was held on March 23, 2000, at the Airport Ramada Inn in Spokane, Washington. LEANA D. LAMB, Member, reviewed the record, including the file, exhibits, and the entire taped proceedings and participated in the decision in the matter. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellants Allison Curry and Cheryl Curry appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC) was represented by John Whitehead, Human Resource Manager.

Background. Appellants' positions are located at the Airway Heights Corrections Center where they are responsible for the purchasing of supplies for the 2000 bed facility. Due to an agency reorganization beginning sometime in late 1997, a number of Appellants' duties were reassigned to a Washington Management Service position.

1 Appellants requested a review of their Supply Control Technician (SCT) positions by submitting classification
2 questionnaires (CQs) to Respondent's Personnel Office on April 7, 1999. Appellants requested that their
3 positions be reallocated to Supply Officers (SOs) 1. By letters dated April 22, 1999, John Whitehead, Human
4 Resource Manager, denied Appellants requests for reallocation.

5
6 On May 20, 1999, Appellants appealed to the Department of Personnel. By letter dated August 27, 1999, the
7 Director's designee informed Appellants that their positions were properly allocated to the Supply Control
8 Technician classification. On September 21, 1999, Appellants filed exceptions to the Director's determination
9 with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellants' exceptions are the subject of these proceedings.

10
11 **Summary of Appellants' Argument.** Appellants disagree with DOP's determination that their positions are
12 properly allocated to the Supply Control Technician classification. Appellants argue that they performed higher
13 level duties for more than three years and Respondent violated WAC 356-01-061 by removing their higher-level
14 work duties and assigning these duties to a Washington Management Service position. Appellants argue that the
15 Department of Personnel erred by interpreting the definition of the word "Department" in the SO 1 classification
16 specification to mean an entire agency or a region rather than adhering to RCW 41.06.020 which states "that
17 unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the words used in this chapter have the meaning given in this
18 section." Appellants also argue that DOP erred by interpreting the word "planning" in the SO specification to
19 mean long-term planning when the specification does not indicate if it is long-term or day-to-day planning.
20 Appellants contend that they perform planning and inventory functions by collecting and evaluating supply and
21 equipment usage data, projecting departmental supply needs, determining optimum stock levels, determining
22 maximum authorizations, standard unit packs and reorder points, and determining available sources of supply.
23 Appellants further argue that they are solely responsible for preparing, evaluating and awarding bids and that for
24 five years they worked independently from their supervisor who never reviewed or approved their work.
25 Appellants contend their duties and responsibilities are best described by the Supply Officer 1 specification.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellants' duties are not accurately reflected in
2 their CQs and that their supervisor indicated his disagreement regarding their duties. Respondent argues that
3 Appellants are not responsible for procurement responsibilities for the entire agency and that DOP appropriately
4 applied the historical interpretation of the word "Department" to mean procurement for the entire agency.
5 Respondent contends that while Appellants do perform some of the duties that are typically assigned to a supply
6 officer, the duties themselves are not higher level. Furthermore, Respondent argues that Appellants were not the
7 sole persons responsible for purchasing because their supervisor had the final signature authority for the
8 institution. Respondent also argued that Appellants' positions did not meet the definition of a Supply Officer 1
9 under the second requirement because they did not serve as principle assistants to a higher level supply officer.
10 Therefore, Respondent argues that Appellants are properly allocated to the SCT specification.

11
12 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellants' positions are properly allocated to the
13 Supply Control Technician classification should be affirmed.

14
15 **Relevant Classifications.** Supply Control Technician, class code 77950, and Supply Officer 1, class code 77960.

16
17 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the
18 overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of
19 work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is
20 not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the
21 duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results
22 in a determination of the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-
23 Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1 The definition in the specification of a Supply Officer 1 indicates that the incumbent “[p]lans, coordinates,
2 supervises or performs procurement and inventory functions for Department; or serves as principle assistant to
3 higher level supply officer.”

4
5 The definition in the specification of a Supply Control Technician states the incumbent “[p]erforms the full range
6 of technical duties under the supervision of the individual responsible for the purchasing of supplies, materials
7 and equipment for an agency, institution, major subdivision, or major operating location of an agency. Supervises
8 and/or participates in purchasing control, maintaining inventory levels, contract and invoice billing, and
9 correspondence work connected with tracing and expediting order.” Under the distinguishing characteristics, the
10 specification indicates, “[p]ositions at this level support an individual responsible for the purchasing of supplies,
11 materials, and equipment for an agency, institution, major subdivision, or major operating location of an agency,
12 by handling the purely technical aspects of purchasing and inventory control.”

13
14 Appellants’ CQs indicate that 80 percent of their duties and responsibilities include planning, coordinating, and
15 performing procurement and inventory functions for a 2000 bed facility and receiving, examining and
16 determining the need for and adequacy of requisitioned supplies and equipment.

17
18 Appellants’ immediate supervisor, Kent Schroeder, is an Account 4. In this case, Mr. Schroeder disagreed with
19 the duties listed on Appellants’ CQs. The documents in the record support Mr. Schroeder’s description of
20 Appellants’ duties. Appellants purchase items at the request of others and are not responsible for examining and
21 determining the need for or adequacy of requisitioned supplies and equipment. Appellants are not responsible for
22 projecting departmental needs, but their suggestions are taken into consideration before the final determination is
23 made.

24
25 The SO2 classification encompasses positions with responsibility for supply functions and long-range planning
26 for an entire agency or regions of large state agencies. Appellants are responsible for day-to-day purchasing

1 activities at only Airway Heights Corrections Center, not for the agency as a whole or for regions of the agency.
2 Therefore, Appellants do not have the level of responsibility or perform the breadth or scope of duties envisioned
3 by the SO 1 classification.

4
5 The scope and level of Appellants' duties are encompassed by the definition and distinguishing characteristics of
6 the Supply Control Technician classification. Therefore, Appellants' positions are properly allocated and the
7 determination of the director should be affirmed.

8
9 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellants should be denied and the Director's determination dated
10 August 27, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

11
12 **ORDER**

13 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellants is denied and the
14 Director's determination dated August 27, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

15 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

16
17 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

18
19 _____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

20
21 _____
Leana D. Lamb, Member